

Patent

Attorney Docket No.: Intel 2207/7086
Assignee: Intel Corporation

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT : Stephen J. JOURDAN et al.
SERIAL NO. : 09/750,150
FILED : December 29, 2000
FOR : MULTI-MODE NON-BINARY PREDICTOR
GROUP ART UNIT : 2183
EXAMINER : Tonia L. MEONSKE

M/S: APPEAL BRIEFS - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Dear Sir:

Appellants respectfully request reconsideration of the decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference that was mailed on October 29, 2007.

Appellants submit this paper to address issues raised in the Decision on Appeal.

REMARKS

First, Appellants would like to gratefully acknowledge the Board's reversal of the §102 rejection of claim 1 under Wang. *See* Decision by Board dated 10/29/2007, pp. 5-6. Appellants agree with the Board's decision that the Wang reference fails to provide at least a prediction value provided by a second table (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). Appellants further agree with the Board's decision that the cited PHT of Wang only provides a value to the VHT, the PHT which Appellants have argued previously that is utilized to determine only if a prediction is to be made. Finally, Appellants agree with the Board's decision that the absence of a disclosed second table providing a prediction value (as described in claim 1) in the Wang reference negates anticipation of claim 1. *See id.*

With regard to rejection of claims 13-26, Appellants respectfully request reconsideration for at least the following reasons. Specifically, the Board asserts that claim 13 fails to recite a second table that provides a prediction value. *See* Decision by Board, p. 7. However, Appellants submit dependent claim 18 describes a multi-mode predictor as described in claim 13, wherein said second table provides said predicted value. Therefore, Appellants submit the rejection of claim 18 as anticipated by Wang is lacking at least for the same reasons as those relating to claim 1 (discussed above). Appellants respectfully request reconsideration of at least the rejection of claim 18 under §102, and further request the Board to reverse said rejection.

CONCLUSION

Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting the aforementioned claims and direct the Examiner to pass the case to issue. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any additional

Serial No. 09/750,150
Request for Reconsideration dated December 31, 2007
Decision on Appeal mailed October 29, 2007

fees which may be necessary for consideration of this paper to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP Deposit

Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: December 31, 2007

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501